


PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Kespat OY
P.O. Box 601
FI-40101 Jyväskylä

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) **04-07-2005**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

PCT237/470TK

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/FI2005/050048

International filing date (day/month/year)

24.02.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

25.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H04N 13/00

Applicant

Nokia Corporation et al

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/SE

Patent- och registreringsverket

Box 5055

S-102 42 STOCKHOLM

Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88

Authorized officer

Jesper Bergstrand /OGU

Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FI2005/050048

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- ☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- ☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/FI2005/050048

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>2-13, 15-26, 28-37, 39-46, 48</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1, 14, 27, 38, 47</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	<u></u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-48</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-48</u>	YES
	Claims	<u></u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document cited in the International Search Report:

D1: EP0830034 A

From D1 an electronic equipment, which includes camera means for forming data on an object located in the imaging direction, in which case the said camera means include at least two camera units and data processing means, which are arranged to process the data formed by the camera means, according to the currently chosen imaging mode of the equipment, in order to form image information is known (refer to page 34, line 5-page 35, line 37; figures 3, 4, 21a, 46, 47, 55 and 56; claims 30, 33, 34 and 44 and abstract) in which equipment, the mutual position of the camera units relative to each other is arranged to be altered to correspond to the current imaging mode.

Consequently, the subject matter of claim 1 is previously known and therefore lacks novelty.

Since the present invention according to the independent claims 14 (system), 27 (method), 38 (program product) and 47 (camera module) does not encompass any technical features not present in claim 1, the analysis above concerning claim 1 is also applicable to these claims. Hence, the present invention according to claims 14, 27, 38 and 47 lacks novelty over D1, and is therefore not patentable.

Furthermore, the methods/systems referred to in claims 2-13,

.../...

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/FI2005/050048

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V.

15-26, 28-37, 39-46 and 48 are considered to lack an inventive step over D1, since what is defined in these claims is not considered to differ essentially from what is known from the cited document (D1). If it can be shown that some aspect covered by claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-37, 39-46 and 48 provides unexpected effects and the claims are restricted accordingly, the judgement may be reconsidered. Until these conditions are met, claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-37, 39-46 and 48 are not considered to involve an inventive step.

Consequently, the claimed invention according to claims 1, 14, 27, 38 and 47 lacks novelty over D1, whereas the claimed invention according to claims 2-13, 15-26, 28-37, 39-46 and 48 is novel, but not considered to involve an inventive step over the teachings of D1.

Further, the claimed invention according to claims 1-48 is industrially applicable.